REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 12 are amended. Claims 5-11 and 16-27 are cancelled. New claims 28-43 are added. No new matter is added.

Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 12-15 Under Section 102

The Final Office Action and Advisory Action reject claims 1-4 and 12-15 in view of Galler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,720) ("Galler et al."). The Final Office Action cited Column 8, lines 11-18 as teaching the step of claiming the dynamic grammar that is recited in claim 1. The Advisory Action notes that Galler et al. teach deriving the dynamic grammar by the disclosure of the dynamic programming alignment (DP alignment) and building a dynamic grammar. See column 8, lines 3-18. Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the reference identifiers are stored prior to receiving user speech input. As we shall see, Galler et al. do not teach this feature of claim 1, thus rendering it patentable.

It is easily shown that the "dynamic grammar" of Galler et al. is not generated from reference identifiers stored prior to receiving user speech input.

Notably, Galler et al. teach that after receiving an utterance (Column 7, line 41), an N-best or M-best hypothesis is generated as a result of speech recognition. These hypotheses are passed to the DP alignment module which may produce a single name as the recognized speech. However, Galler et al. note that in most cases a single candidate does not result from the DP alignment module in which case the N-best and M-best hypothesis are passed to module 42 to build a dynamic grammar. Module 42 then builds a grammar using the N-best and M-best candidates provided in the DP alignment modules. Column 9, lines 3-21.

Applicants respectfully submit that because Galler et al. teach using the results of the user input, namely the N-best and M-best hypothesis from input utterances, the reference clearly does

not teach deriving a dynamic grammar from data elements that are associated with the reference identifiers that match any one of selection identifiers. As recited in claim 1, it is the selection identifiers that are generated from the user input.

In other words, claim 1 requires that the dynamic grammar is derived from data elements associated with reference identifiers which are stored prior to receiving user input. This is in contrast to Galler et al. in which their dynamic grammar is generated from the N-best and M-best hypothesis and not from data elements that are associated with reference identifiers as is recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4 each depend from claim 1 and recite further limitations there from. Accordingly, these claims are patentable as well.

Claim 12 is of similar scope to claim 1 and is thus patentable for the same reasons set forth above. Furthermore, claims 13-15 depend from claim 12 and are patentable as well.

New Claims

New claims 28-43 are added with new dependent claims and computer-readable embodiment. Applicants submit that there new claims are patentable for the reasons set forth above. We do also note that claims 29, 31 and 37 recite that an N-best hypothesis which represents the selection identifier is compared to the reference identifiers to identify matches for use in deriving the dynamic grammar. This feature is not taught or suggested by Galler et al.

New claims 28-43 are added with new dependent claims and computer-readable embodiment. Applicant submits that there new claims are patentable for the reasons set forth above. In claims 38 – 43, the limitation is added that the dynamic grammar is derived for use in processing second user input received after receiving the user speech input. Support for these limitations is found at least on page 7 of the specification. Galler et al. clearly utilize their

dynamic grammar a single or first user input as is shown in FIG. 5. The dynamic grammar is not taught or suggested as being generated after receiving user input and for use in processing second user input. Accordingly, for these additional reasons, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. The Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Isaacson, Irving, Stelacone & Prass, LLC**, **Account No. 502960** for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 7, 2006

By: /Thomas M. Isaacson/

Thomas M. Isaacson

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433

Correspondence Address:
Thomas A. Restaino
Reg. No. 33,444
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921